



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/738,388

12/16/2003

Pierre Tequi

T-6192

7245

34014 7590 05/21/2007
CHEVRON TEXACO CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 6006
SAN RAMON, CA 94583-0806

EXAMINER

GOLOBOY, JAMES C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/738,388	Applicant(s) TEQUI ET AL.	
	Examiner James Goloboy	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Claims 1-2, 5, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li (U.S. Pat. No. 6,288,012) in view of the Evidence provided by Solozhenko (Properties of Group III Nitrides, J.H. Edgar ed., Section 2.1, page 43).

The rationale for this rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 3 of the office action mailed 8/28/06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacholke (U.S. Pat. No. 4,715,972) in view of Dickey (*Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, Vol. 15., *Lubrication and Lubricants*, p. 33) and Papay (U.S. Pat. No. 5,652,201).

Pacholke discloses in column 3 lines 20-53 an additive composition comprising boron nitride (line 24) and a carrier fluid (column 6 lines 10-21), which may be an oil. Pacholke also discloses in column 3 lines 54-55 that the additive is added to a lubricating oil, specifically a gear oil. In column 5 line 37, Pacholke further discloses an additive composition comprising 25% of an olefin copolymer by weight. As the disclosure does not reveal the possibility of any additional components in the additive, it is clear that the carrier fluid (oil) and solid lubricant (boron nitride) must make up the other 75%, falling within the range recited in Claim 6.

In column 4 line 63, Pacholke discloses a concentration of between 0.01 and 65% for boron nitride within the full additive composition. In column 5 line 39, Pacholke discloses a concentration of between 3.0 and 5.0% by weight for the olefin copolymer component. As the only other component in the additive mixture is the oil dispersion of boron nitride, this dispersion therefore makes up between 95 to 97% by weight of the additive composition, meaning that the concentration of boron nitride in the oil dispersion is between about 0.01 and about 68% ($65/95 = 0.68$), encompassing the range recited in Claim 4. In column 4 lines 63-65, Pacholke notes that the final selection a boron nitride concentration from within the disclosed range depends on the application, signifying the concentration as a result-effective variable. Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. See MPEP § 2144.05 (B). Case law holds that “discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art.” See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Pacholke also shows, in columns 6-7 (Examples 1-3), three sample additive compositions comprising equal amounts of a solid lubricant and a neutral petroleum oil—equivalent to a 50% dispersion of the solid lubricant in oil, matching the 50% endpoint of the range recited in Claim 4. Although the sample compositions utilize molybdenum disulfide and graphite as the solid lubricant, the list in column 3 lines 22-27

Art Unit: 1714

names boron nitride as an alternative solid lubricant, and the sample compositions strongly suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the 50% dispersion recited in Claim 4.

In column 5 line 46, Pacholke discloses a range of between 0.001 to 10% by weight of the additive composition in the overall lubricant composition, substantially overlapping the range recited in Claim 22.

The differences between Pacholke and the currently presented claims are:

- i) Pacholke does not specifically disclose hexagonal boron nitride.
- ii) Pacholke does not disclose the further addition of a polymethacrylate or a dispersant olefin copolymer.

With respect to i), Dickey discloses on page 33 that hexagonal boron nitride provides "excellent lubrication". No other types of boron nitride are mentioned in the article.

With respect to ii), Papay teaches in column 46 lines 26-43 viscosity index improvers which are standard lubricant additives suitable for use in gear oils (column 47 lines 51-54). The viscosity index improvers include ethylene-propylene copolymers grafted with maleic anhydride and possibly further reacted with an alcohol or alkylene polyamine, forming a dispersant olefin copolymer, and also polymers of alkyl methacrylates and copolymers of alkyl methacrylates with nitrogen-containing polymers. Papay thus discloses both non-dispersant and dispersant polymethacrylates.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the hexagonal form of the boron nitride disclosed by Pacholke, in order to gain extra lubricity, based on the teaching of Dickey. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 1714

add the viscosity index improvers of Papay to the composition of Pacholke in order to improve the viscosity properties of the lubricant at high and low temperatures, and also to impart dispersancy.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacholke in view of Dickey and Papay as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, and 20-23 above, and further in view of De Vries (U.S. Pat. No. 4,094,799).

The discussion of Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in paragraph 2 above is incorporated here by reference. Pacholke does not disclose a particle size distribution for the boron nitride.

De Vries, in column 2 lines 14-28, discloses a solid lubricant additive which may be boron nitride (line 26), and preferably has a maximum particle size of as low as 0.001 microns (1 millimicron, lines 19-21):

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the additive composition taught by Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay a boron nitride with the small particle size taught by De Vries, in order to impart superior lubricity to the composition, as disclosed in column 2 lines 14-16 of De Vries.

4. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacholke in view of Dickey and Papay as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, and 20-23 above, and further in view of Ishikawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,780,399).

Art Unit: 1714

The discussion of Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in paragraph 2 above is incorporated here by reference. Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay disclose a composition including a non-dispersant or dispersant polymethacrylate, but do not disclose the length of the hydrocarbon side chain on the polymethacrylate.

Ishikawa discloses in column 8 lines 34-49 that a non-dispersant polymethacrylate preferably has a hydrocarbon chain with 1 to 18 carbons, and in column 9 lines 8-14 discloses that the dispersant polymethacrylate also has a hydrocarbon chain with 1 to 18 carbons. Although the terms "short", "medium", and "long" recited in Claims 7 and 8 are not defined within the claim, the range given in the reference for the length of the hydrocarbon chains encompasses all the types disclosed on page 8 lines 18-28 of the present specification. The detailed description is a dictionary for the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(g).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate into the lubricant composition of Li a polymethacrylate with a short, medium, or long hydrocarbon chain for the purpose of obtaining enhanced viscosity-temperature behavior and perhaps enhanced dispersancy.

5. Claims 10-13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacholke in view of Dickey and Papay as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, and 20-23 above, and further in view of Peeler (U.S. Pat. No. 3,313,727).

The discussion of Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in paragraph 2 above is incorporated here by reference. In column 37 lines 56-66 and column 39 lines 23-39

Art Unit: 1714

(Example C-5), Papay teaches that the lubricating composition can additionally contain an alkali metal borate in order to help prevent scuffing. Papay does not disclose whether the borates are hydrated.

Peeler, in the reference's Claims 1 discloses an oil dispersion of an alkali metal borate and a dispersant (the borate is "dispersed by means of a lyophilic surface active agent"), as recited in Claims 10 and 14. In the reference's Claims 5 and 6, Peeler teaches that the alkali metal may be sodium or potassium, as in Claims 11 and 12. In the reference's Claim 1 is it also taught that the borate is present in the oil dispersion in a concentration of 2 to 60% by weight, substantially overlapping the broad ranges recited in Claim 15 and 19, and encompassing the range recited in Claim 16 while matching the endpoint at 2%.

Peeler further discloses in column 3 lines 35-36 that a detergent may be added to the dispersion as recited in Claim 17, and in column 3 lines 38-39 teaches that the detergent may be present in a concentration of 0.1 to 5%, overlapping the range recited in Claim 18.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the lubricant composition of Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay the oil dispersions of hydrated alkali metal borates disclosed by Peeler in order to obtain better extreme pressure lubricating performance, as taught in column 1 lines 53-56 of Peeler, and to avoid scuffing at extreme pressures as taught by Papay and Peeler at column 1 line 29. It would have been obvious to include a detergent in the oil dispersion of hydrated alkali metal borates for the purpose of preventing the buildup of residues.

Art Unit: 1714

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacholke in view of Dickey, Papay, and Peeler as applied to claims 10-13 and 15-19 above, and further in view of Brown (U.S. Pat. No. 5,641,730).

The discussion of Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in view of Peeler in paragraph 14 above is incorporated here by reference. Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in view of Peeler does not disclose hydrated potassium triborate as an alkali metal borate additive. Papay, in example C-5, does disclose potassium triborate as an additive but does not disclose whether it is hydrated.

Brown, in column 2 lines 26-27 discloses the use of hydrated potassium triborate as a preferred alkali metal borate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Pacholke, Dickey, and Papay in view of Peeler to include the use of hydrated potassium triborate due to its favorable extreme pressure properties, as taught in column 2 line 30-32 of Brown.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and evidence regarding the toxicity of boron nitride are persuasive and therefore the obviousness rejections based on Li have been withdrawn. Applicant's argument that the ethylene-propylene copolymer of Pacholke is non-dispersant is also persuasive and therefore the rejections based on Pacholke set forth

Art Unit: 1714

in the office action mailed 8/28/06 are also withdrawn. New rejections based on Pacholke and meeting the limitations of the claims have been set forth above.

Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-2, 5, and 20-21 as anticipated by Li have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's citation from *Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.* requires a "pattern of preference" in order to narrow down a broad genus to a narrow genus to which *In re Schaumann* can be applied. However, the class of morphological species of boron nitride is already a narrow genus, containing just four species as taught by Solozhenko. *Sanofi-Synthelabo* therefore does not apply here. Applicant also cites *Schering Corp. v. Precision-Cosmet Co's* summary of *In re Schaumann*. It is noted that *Schering Corp.*, in holding an alkyl styrene to be not anticipated, draws a distinction between a broad genus of over one hundred styrenes, and the "small, definite, and limited class of compounds" relied upon in *In re Petering* and *In re Schaumann*. The morphological species of boron nitride are clearly a "small, definite, and limited class of compounds". *In re Schaumann* does *not* require a teaching to select a particular species from within the narrow genus, rather that the genus be limited enough that "the reference provides a description of those compounds just as surely as if they were identified in the reference by name". In view of the teaching of Solozhenko that there are only four morphological species of boron nitride, this standard is clearly met.

Art Unit: 1714

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Goloboy whose telephone number is 571-272-2476. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James C. Goloboy
JCG

Vasu Jagannathan
VASU JAGANNATHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700